UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,405	03/15/2001	Frank Rademacher	964-010251	3576
	7590 03/26/200 AW FIRM, P.C.	EXAMINER		
700 KOPPERS	BUILDING	SENFI, BEHROOZ M		
436 SEVENTH PITTSBURGH	-		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/809,405	RADEMACHER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
BEHROOZ SENFI	2621		

	BEHROOZ SENFI	2621				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO			
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see NOTw);	TE below);				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a composition NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [·	•	-			
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	ided below or appended.	r be entered and an e.	Apianation of			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8 and 10-15</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10.	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:						
	/Tung Vo/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2621				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to applicant's arguments/remarks, please see (remarks, dated 3/3/2008, pages 3 - 4) thus mainly argues that the Camera in Enkelmann is used for measurement of the distance of an obstacle.

In response, Applicant arguments is not persuasive, because; Thomas Enkelmann clearly in fig. 2, shows the industrial truck (fork lift) having multiple cameras, such as 2 - 2" mounted on the truck, and a display/monitor 1 is being used to provide the image information to the operator of the truck, as stated in (page, 2, last paragraph, page 4, last paragraph and page 5, whole page), and further as shown in fig. 2, the camera 2" mounted on the rear of the industrial truck and above the counterweight at a first hight; also Thomas further indicates that, further camera can be mounted at the front or rear of the industrial truck (please see, page 5 of Thomas). However, Thomas does not explicitly mention additional/further camera can be used to provide a view of a near area behind the industrial truck. therefore, examiner used the secondary reference, Rosinski (i.e., figs. 5B, 7A, 8B - 8C and 11 - 12, col. 2, lines 58 - 63, col. 4, lines 7 - 15) thus clearly shows different arrangement of the cameras mounted on the vehicle/truck pointing toward the rear of the truck/vehicle for the purpose of allowing the operator of the vehicle/truck to view the blind spots, e.g., near area behind, one-half inch to infinity, behind the vehicle/truck. Therefore, taking the teaching of Thomas and Rosinski, as a whole, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Rosinski into method and device for driving/controlling vehicles of Thomas to increase field of view and allow the operator to view the blind spots behind the vehicle/truck.